



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,837	08/07/2001	Tomotoshi Sato	210263US-2	8604
22850	7590	11/10/2004	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			LIN, KELVIN Y	
1940 DUKE STREET			ART UNIT	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			PAPER NUMBER	

2142

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/922,837

Applicant(s)

SATO, TOMOTOSHI

Examiner

Kelvin Lin

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08/07/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Levi A. (U.S. Patent 6636983).
3. Regarding claim 1, Levi teaches a peripheral device configured to be connected to a plurality of peripheral devices via a network, said peripheral device comprising: means for managing said plurality of peripheral devices (Levi, col. 2, l. 10-22).
4. Regarding claim 2, Levi further discloses the peripheral device of claim 1, further comprising: means for selecting one peripheral device out of said peripheral devices to manage said peripheral devices (Levi, col. 14, l.56-61).
5. Regarding claim 3, Levi further discloses the peripheral device of claim 2, further comprising:
 - a web server (Levi, col.30, l.61-65); and

- means for setting a default URL for said web server to correspond to a web server of said one peripheral device selected by said means for selecting (Levi, col. 31, l.6-15).
6. Regarding claim 4, Levi further discloses the peripheral device of claim 3, further comprising:
- means for enabling said means for managing when said one peripheral device selected by said means for selecting is said peripheral device (Levi, Fig. 11, col.22, l.6-18).
7. Regarding claim 5, Levi further discloses the peripheral device of claim 3, further comprising:
- means for disabling said means for managing when said one peripheral device selected by said means for selecting is not said peripheral device (Levi, col.23, l.45-55).
8. Regarding claim 6, Levi further discloses the peripheral device of claim 3, further wherein said means for managing comprises:
- means for receiving instructions from a user station connected to said network (Levi, col. 22, l.46-54);
 - means for requesting and receiving information from said plurality of peripheral devices (Levi, col. 23, l.2-5);
 - means for setting configurations for said plurality of peripheral devices (Levi, col.12, l.61-66); and
 - means for sending information to said user station (Levi, col.13,

I.23-30).

9. Regarding claim 7, Levi further discloses the peripheral device of claim 3, further comprising means for printing (Levi, col. 11, I.10).
10. Regarding claim 8, Levi further discloses the peripheral device of claim 3, wherein said means for selecting comprises means for comparing a characteristic for each of said plurality of peripheral devices (Levi, col.31, I.26-32).
11. Regarding claim 9, Levi further discloses the peripheral device of claim 1, further comprising:
 - means for checking if another peripheral device is managing said plurality of peripheral devices (Levi, col. 4, I. 8-34).
12. Regarding claim 10, Levi further discloses the peripheral device of claim 5, further comprising:
 - means for disabling said means for managing when said other peripheral device is managing said plurality of peripheral devices (Levi, col.23, I.45-55);
 - a web server (Levi, col. 30, I.57-67)); and
 - means for setting a default URL for said web server to correspond to a web server of said other peripheral device (Levi, col. 31, I. 4-22) .

13. Regarding claims 11-20 have similar limitations as claims 1-10. Therefore, claims 11-20 are rejected under Levi for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-10.
14. Regarding claim 21 has similar limitations as combination of claims 1-3. Therefore, claim 21 is rejected under Levi for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-3.
15. Regarding claim 22, Levi further discloses the method of claim 21, further comprising the step of: disabling managing means of peripheral devices other than said one peripheral device (Levi, col. 23, l.45-55).
16. Regarding claim 23, Levi further discloses the method of claim 21, wherein the step of managing from said one peripheral device comprises the step of: receiving instructions from a user station connected to said network (Levi, col. 22, l.46-54).
17. Regarding claim 24, Levi further discloses the method of claim 21, wherein the step of managing from said one peripheral device comprises the step of: requesting and receiving information from said plurality of peripheral devices (Levi, col. 23, l.2-5).
18. Regarding claim 25 has similar limitations as combination of claim 6. Therefore, claim 25 is rejected under Levi for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 6.
19. Regarding claims 26-27 have similar limitations as claims 7-8. Therefore,

claims 26-27 are rejected under Levi for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 7-8.

20. Regarding claim 28, Levi further discloses a computer program product, comprising:
 - a computer storage medium and a computer program code mechanism embedded in the computer storage medium for causing a peripheral device to manage a plurality of peripheral devices connected to a network (Levi, col.4, l.9-24),
the computer program code mechanism comprising:
 - a first computer code device configured to manage said plurality of peripheral devices from one peripheral device (Levi, col. 6, l.14-21).
21. Regarding claim 29, Levi further discloses the computer program product of claim 28, further comprising: a second computer code device configured to select said one peripheral device out of said peripheral devices to manage said peripheral devices (Levi, Fig.1).
22. Regarding claim 30, Levi further discloses the computer program product of claim 28, further comprising: a second computer code device configured to check which peripheral device is managing said plurality of peripheral devices (Levi, Fig. 6A, col. 17, l. 37-50).
23. Regarding claim 31, Levi further discloses the computer program product of claim 30, further comprising: a third computer code device configured to enable said first computer code device (Levi, col. 15, l.62-67).

24. Regarding claim 32, Levi further discloses the computer program product of claim 30, further comprising: a third computer code device configured to disable said first computer code device and to set a URL of a web server to correspond to a web server for said peripheral device managing said plurality of peripheral devices (Levi, col. 16, l.1-37, col. 32, l8-10).
25. Regarding claim 33, Levi further discloses the computer program product of claim 28, wherein said first computer code device comprises: a second computer code device configured to receive instructions from a user station connected to said network (Levi, col. 6, l. 14-15, col.22, l.45-54).
26. Regarding claim 34, Levi further discloses the computer program product of claim 28, wherein said first computer code device comprises: a second computer code device configured to request and receive information from said plurality of peripheral devices (Levi, col. 23, l.2-5).
27. Regarding claim 35, Levi further discloses the computer program product of claim 28, wherein said first computer code device comprises: a second computer code device configured to receive instructions from a user station connect to said network; a third computer code device configured to request and receive information from said plurality of peripheral devices; a fourth computer code device configured to set configurations for said plurality of peripheral devices; and a fifth computer code device configured to send information to said user station (Levi, col. 22, l.19-42).

28. Regarding claim 36, Levi further discloses the computer program product of claim 29, wherein said second computer code device comprises a third computer code device configured to compare a characteristic for each of said plurality of peripheral devices (Levi, col. 17, l. 14-36).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to application's disclosure.

- Hakim O. (Patent No. 6760748) Instructional System Grouping Student Terminals.
- Underwood R. (Patent No. 6633878) Initializing An Ecommerce Database Framework.
- Bowman-Amuah M. (Patent No. 6662357) Managing Information in An Integrated Development Architecture Framework.
- Carley et al., (Patent No. 6701345) Providing A Notification When A Plurality of Users Are Altering Similar Data In A Health Care Solution Environment.
- ACM – Jim Waldo, Jini Architecture for Network-centric Computing, Communication of the ACM, Vol. 42, No. 7, 1999, pp. 76-82.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kelvin Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-3898. The examiner can normally be reached on Flexible 4/9/5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Harvey can be reached on 571-272-3896. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KYL
10/26/04


JACK B. HARVEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER